

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00213 01 OF 03 101957Z POSS DUPE
ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 /026 W
-----102241Z 121191 /64

O 101906Z MAY 77
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO USDEL SECRETARY LONDON IMMEDIATE
INFO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2114
USMISSION NATO IMMEDIATE
AMEMBASSY BONN IMMEDIATE
AMEMBASSY PARIS IMMEDIATE

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 3 MBFR VIENNA 0213

EXDIS

ACDA FOR LEON SLOSS; DEPT PASS SECDEF

E.O. 1152: GDS
TAGS: OVIP, UK
SUBJ: MBFR: FRG PROPOSAL ON DATA ISSUE

REF: SECTO 4017

1. THERE ARE GROUNDS FOR DOUBT AS TO WHETHER THE EAST WILL
ACCEPT THE GERMAN CONCEPT AND WHETHER THE EAST WILL BE WILLING
TO RECIPROCAT WITH ITS DATA, ENABLING THE DATA DISCUSSION TO
PROCEED. THEREFORE, THE FRG CONCEPT SHOULD BE PRESENTED IN A
WAY WHICH MAXIMIZES ITS CHANCES OF ACCEPTANCE AND DEPRIVES
THE EAST OF SOME OF ITS COUNTER ARGUMENTS. FOLLOWING IS DELEGA-
TION'S JUDGMENT ON HOW BEST TO REFINE FOR PRESENTATION TO THE
EAST THE FRG APPROACH.

2. PRIOR TO ADVANCING TO THE EAST A PROPOSAL ON THE LINES OF
THE FRG CONCEPT, THE WEST SHOULD PUBLISH IN A NATO BULLETIN
TOTAL FIGURES BY INDIVIDUAL COUNTRIES ON GROUND AND AIR FORCE
ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL OF THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN THE
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00213 01 OF 03 101957Z POSS DUPE

REDUCTION AREA AS OF 1 JANUARY 1976.

A. IF THE FRG DESIRES, THE PUBLICATION COULD ALSO INCLUDE
TOTAL US AND UK FORCES IN EUROPE, BUT THE MANPOWER TOTALS OF
INDIVIDUAL DIRECT PARTICIPANT COUNTRIES IN THE REDUCTION AREA
MUST BE CLEAR.

B. WE WOULD ALSO NOT OBJECT TO PUBLISHING NATIONAL DATA OF OTHER ALLIES PARTICIPATING IN THE NATO'S INTEGRATED DEFENSE PROGRAM WITH TROOPS OUTSIDE THE REDUCTION AREA, I.E., SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS IN MBFR, IF THE GERMANS DESIRE THIS IN ORDER TO MAKE THE PUBLICATION APPEAR LESS RELATED TO MBFR. BUT THIS LATTER EFFORT SHOULD NOT BE PURSUED IF SOME OF THE ALLIES INVOLVED SHOULD OBJECT TO IT AND THE PROJECT WOULD THUS BE DELAYED. WE SEE NO POINT IN TRYING TO INCLUDE FIGURES ON FRENCH FORCES IN THE FRG.

3. IT IS IMPORTANT THAT SUCH PUBLICATION SHOULD APPEAR BEFORE WESTERN REPS IN VIENNA MAKE AN APPROACH TO THE EAST ON THE LINES OF THE FRG PROPOSAL.

4. WESTERN NEGOTIATORS WOULD BE AUTHORIZED TO CONFIRM THE ACCURACY OF THE PUBLISHED FIGURES TO THE EAST.

5. ONLY IF THE INFORMATION DESCRIBED IS PUBLISHED AND ITS ACCURACY CONFIRMED TO THE EAST WILL IT BE POSSIBLE TO MAKE THE POINT TO THE EAST THAT THE DATA THEY WANT UNDER NATIONAL TOTALS IS ALREADY AVAILABLE AND THAT, IN THE INTEREST OF EFFECTIVE DATA DISCUSSION TO IDENTIFY THE SOURCES OF THE DISCREPANCY BETWEEN WESTERN AND EASTERN FIGURES ON WARSAW PACT FORCES, IT IS NECESSARY TO PASS TO THE NEXT STEP. IF THE FRG CONCEPT IS TO HAVE SOME CHANCE OF ACCEPTANCE BY EAST, EASTERN NEGOTIATORS MUST BE IN A POSITION TO INFORM MOSCOW AT THE TIME WHEN THEY REPORT ON NEW WESTERN PROPOSAL THAT WESTERN NATIONAL TOTALS ARE ALREADY AVAILABLE. OTHERWISE, THE ENTIRE EAST-WEST DISCUSSION ON FURTHER COURSE OF DATA DISCUSSION MAY REVOLVE AROUND NATIONAL DATA ISSUE, THE VERY OUTCOME THE FRG WISHES TO AVOID.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00213 01 OF 03 101957Z POSS DUPE

6. AS AN ADDITIONAL POSSIBILITY, FOLLOWING PUBLICATION WESTERN NEGOTIATORS IN VIENNA COULD INFORMALLY APPROACH THE SOVIETS. THEY WOULD DRAW ATTENTION TO THE NATO BULLETIN. THEY WOULD CONFIRM THE ACCURACY OF THE FIGURES CONTAINED IN IT. THEY WOULD EXPRESS THE EXPECTATION THAT THE EAST WILL MAKE ITS NATIONAL FIGURES AVAILABLE. HOWEVER, THEY WOULD NOT INSIST THAT THE EAST DO THIS OR MAKE IT A CONDITION OF FURTHER DATA DISCUSSION.

A. IF THE SOVIETS THEN TABLED NATIONAL TOTALS, THE WEST WOULD THEN MAKE A PROPOSAL ALONG THE LINES OF THE GERMAN CONCEPT, PRESENTING IT AS THE NEXT LOGICAL STEP IN DATA DISCUSSION.

B. IF SUCCESSFUL, THIS COURSE WOULD HAVE THE CONSIDERABLE ADVANTAGE THAT THE EAST WOULD NOT MAKE AN ISSUE OF THE WEST'S FAILURE TO TABLE NATIONAL FIGURES OR REFUSE TO PROCEED FURTHER IN BREAKING DOWN DATA UNTIL THIS WAS DONE. THIS APPROACH WOULD ALSO WEAKEN ANTICIPATED EASTERN OBJECTIONS TO THE GERMAN CONCEPT ONCE TABLED THAT THE WEST IS SEEKING TO OBTAIN INTELLIGENCE

INFORMATION ON THE STRENGTH OF MAJOR UNITS RATHER THAN DISCUSSING
DATA RELEVANT TO THE MBFR NEGOTIATIONS.

C. IF THE SOVIETS DO NOT AGREE TO TABLING EASTERN DATA, THE WEST
WOULD MOVE FORWARD IMMEDIATELY TO MAKE A PROPOSAL ALONG THE LINES
OF THE GERMAN CONCEPT AS A REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE TO THE TABLING
OF NATIONAL TOTALS.

D. COMMENT: IF THIS POINT HAS ALREADY BEEN DISCUSSED WITH THE
FRG AND IT IS NOT CONSIDERED APPROPRIATE TO PRESS IT FURTHER,
IT CAN BE DROPPED.

NOTE BY OC/T: NOT PASSED TO SECDEF.

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00213 02 OF 03 102128Z POSS DUPE
ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 /026 W

-----102241Z 122980 /64

O 101906Z MAY 77 ZFF6

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO USDEL SECRETARY LONDON IMMEDIATE

INFO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2115

USMISSION NATO IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY BONN IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY PARIS IMMEDIATE

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 3 MBFR VIENNA 0213

EXDIS

ACDA FOR LEON SLOSS; DEPT PASS SECDEF

7. THE FIRST STEP PROPOSED BY FRG, TABLING OF WESTERN DATA
FOR US AND SOVIET FORCES, SHOULD BE DROPPED. WE DO NOT THINK
IT DESIRABLE TO TABLE WESTERN DATA ON SOVIET FORCES BECAUSE
IT WOULD PUT THE WEST IN POSITION OF HAVING TO DEFEND WESTERN
ESTIMATES INSTEAD OF OBLIGING THE EAST TO DEFEND ITS DATA ON
ITS OWN FORCES. MOREOVER, THIS STEP, WHICH IS CONTROVERSIAL,
WOULD REDUCE CHANCES OF EASTERN ACCEPTANCE OF THE BASIC FRG
PROPOSAL.

8. THE SECOND STEP PROPOSED BY THE FRG (PARA 2A REFTEL) THAT
EACH SIDE SHOULD TABLE THE TOTAL STRENGTH FOR EACH SIDE

OF ALL PERSONNEL IN FIELD ARMIES, SUPPLY FORCES AND TERRITORIAL ARMIES FOR BOTH SIDES, SHOULD BE DROPPED IN ITS PRESENT FORM.
THIS STEP WOULD NOT CONTRIBUTE TO THE WESTERN PURPOSE OF OBTAINING MORE EASTERN DATA IN A FORM WHICH CAN BE COMPARED WITH WESTERN INTELLIGENCE HOLDINGS. MOREOVER, ITS IMPLEMENTATION WOULD REQUIRE EXTENSIVE NEGOTIATION BETWEEN EAST AND WEST AND EVEN WITHIN NATO TO ESTABLISH ON A COMPARABLE BASIS THE CONCEPTS OF FIELD ARMY, SUPPLY FORCES AND TERRITORIAL ARMY AND THE DIVIDING

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00213 02 OF 03 102128Z POSS DUPE

LINES BETWEEN THESE CATEGORIES.

9. INSTEAD, WE WOULD MODIFY THE THIRD STEP PROPOSED BY THE FRG (PARA 2B) AS FOLLOWS TO INCREASE ITS ACCEPTABILITY TO THE EAST: THE WEST SHOULD PROPOSE TO THE EAST THAT THE NEXT STEP IN DATA DISCUSSION SHOULD BE THE TABLING OF TWO BLOCKS OF FIGURES BY EACH SIDE:

A. THE FIRST OF THESE BLOCKS SHOULD CONSIST OF LISTING EACH EASTERN GROUND ARMY, CORPS, AIR FORCE DIVISION AND, IN CASES WHERE THESE ARE NOT SUBORDINATE TO A LARGER COMMAND, EACH INDEPENDENT GROUND FORCE DIVISION, AND AIR REGIMENTS, AND OF LISTING THE WESTERN EQUIVALENTS OF THESE EASTERN UNITS. EACH SIDE WOULD LIST THESE UNITS FROM NORTH TO SOUTH IN ACCORDANCE WITH THEIR PRESENT DEPLOYMENT. EACH SUCH MAJOR UNIT WOULD BE GIVEN ITS OFFICIAL DESIGNATION AND ITS NATIONALITY, TOGETHER WITH ITS ACTUAL NUMERICAL STRENGTH AS OF 1 JANUARY 1976.

B. IN DISTINCTION TO THE FRG APPROACH, IT WOULD NOT BE NECESSARY TO REQUIRE THAT THE EAST SPECIFY THE PRECISE GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION OF UNIT HEADQUARTERS. THE EAST IS LIKELY TO REACT NEGATIVELY TO SUCH A REQUIREMENT, AND TO CLAIM THAT IT IS CONNECTED WITH AN EFFORT TO OBTAIN INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION.

C. SIMILARLY, THE WEST SHOULD NOT AT THIS STAGE REQUEST EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION ON THE STRENGTH OF EACH WARSAW PACT DIVISION, AS SUGGESTED BY THE FRG, BUT INSTEAD USE LARGER COMPONENTS EXCEPT TO PROVIDE FOR CASES WHERE INDIVIDUAL UNITS ARE INDEPENDENT OF LARGER COMMANDS. NATO SHOULD ENVISAGE ASKING THE EAST FOR DIVISION STRENGTHS AT A LATER STAGE. BUT THE PROPOSED MODIFICATION IS DESIRABLE IN ORDER TO AVOID AN ADVERSE EASTERN REACTION TO THE INITIAL WESTERN PROPOSAL ON THE GROUNDS THAT THE WEST IS SEEKING INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION. AT THE SAME TIME, IT IS NECESSARY TO USE A FORMULATION WHICH WILL MAKE CLEAR TO THE EAST WHAT THE WEST IS ASKING FOR. A MORE GENERAL FORMULATION SUCH AS "MAJOR UNITS" WOULD BE TOO VAGUE.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00213 02 OF 03 102128Z POSS DUPE

D. THE SECOND BLOCK OF FIGURES TO BE TABLED BY EACH SIDE WOULD BE TOTALS FOR ALL REMAINING ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN THE REDUCTION AREA OTHER THAN THOSE CONTAINED IN THE MAJOR UNITS JUST DESCRIBED. THIS DATA SHOULD BE ORGANIZED BY NATIONALITY AND DIVIDED INTO GROUND AND AIR COMPONENTS.

NOTE BY OC/T: NOT PASSED TO SECDEF.

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00213 03 OF 03 102130Z POSS DUPE
ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 /026 W
-----102240Z 123009 /64

O 101906Z MAY 77 ZFF6
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO USDEL SECRETARY LONDON IMMEDIATE
INFO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2116
USMISSION NATO IMMEDIATE
AMEMBASSY BONN IMMEDIATE
AMEMBASSY PARIS IMMEDIATE

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 3 OF 3 MBFR VIENNA 0213

EXDIS

ACDA FOR LEON SLOSS; DEPT PASS SECDEF

10. TO SUM UP, FOR THE FRG APPROACH TO HAVE SOME CHANCE OF SUCCES, IT SHOULD INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING POINTS:

A. AS FRG HAS SUGGESTED MIGHT BE POSSIBLE, THE WEST MUST BE PREPARED TO IDENTIFY MAJOR UNITS BY NATIONALITY, AS WELL AS BY THEIR OFFICIAL DESIGNATION AND STRENGTH.

B. THE WEST MUST ALSO BE PREPARED TO IDENTIFY ON A NATIONAL BASIS THE TOTAL OF ACTIVE DUTY PERSONNEL OTHER THAN THOSE OF MAJOR UNITS.

C. IN ORDER TO AVOID UNPRODUCTIVE ARGUMENT WITH THE EAST THAT THE WEST IS PURSUING ITS OWN REDUCTION APPROACH IN A

DATA DISCUSSION WHICH IS SUPPOSED TO BE WITHOUT PREJUDICE
TO THE POSITIONS OF BOTH SIDES, THE WEST MUST ALSO PROPOSE AT
LEAST ONE LEVEL OF DISAGGREGATION OF AIR FORCE MANPOWER. SO
THAT WESTERN EXPERTS CAN OBTAIN THE INFORMATION NECESSARY TO
LOCATE THE SOURCES OF THE DISCREPANCY BETWEEN WESTERN AND EASTERN
DATA, IT WILL ALSO BE NECESSARY TO DIVIDE NON-DIVISIONAL MANPOWER
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00213 03 OF 03 102130Z POSS DUPE

BETWEEN GROUND AND AIR.

D. FINALLY, THE WEST SHOULD PUBLISH NATIONAL DATA AS
DESCRIBED ABOVE PRIOR TO ADVANCING THE FRG PROPOSAL TO THE EAST.

11. THE PROJECTS OF PREPARING A DRAFT GUIDANCE TO THE AD HOC
GROUP AND PUBLISHING NATO DATA SHOULD BE WORKED OUT WITH SPEED.
THE LONGER THE EAST IS ALLOWED TO DEBATE THE NATIONAL DATA ISSUE
WITHOUT THE FRG ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL BEING MADE, THE GREATER THE
RISK THAT TABLING NATIONAL DATA WILL BECOME THE FOCUS OF THE
NEGOTIATIONS AND THE LESS THE CHANCES OF ACCEPTANCE OF THE FRG
ALTERNATIVE.

12. IN THIS SENSE, WORK AT NATO SHOULD BE DIVIDED INTO TWO STAGES.
(A) THE FIRST SHOULD CONSIST OF FORMULATING AND APPROVING
GUIDANCE TO THE AD HOC GROUP ON THE BASIS OF WHICH THE AD HOC
GROUP COULD PROPOSE TO THE EAST IN GENERAL TERMS HOW THE WEST
VISUALIZES THE NEXT STEP IN DATA EXCHANGE DESIGNED TO IDENTIFY
THE SOURCE OF THE DISCREPANCY BETWEEN WESTERN AND EASTERN FIGURES
ON WARSAW PACT MILITARY MANPOWER . (B) THE SECOND SEGMENT SHOULD

CONSIST OF GUIDANCE CONTAINING THE ACTUAL DATA THE WEST WOULD
TABLE IF THE EAST AGREES TO THE WESTERN PROPOSAL, PLUS THE TEXT
OF APPROPRIATE WESTERN DISCLAIMERS AS ALREADY PROPOSED BY
WASHINGTON AGENCIES. IT IS NOT NECESSARY FOR WESTERN NEGOTIATORS
TO HAVE THIS SECOND SEGMENT AVAILABLE AT THE TIME WHEN THEY PUT
THE FRG PROPOSAL TO THE EAST FOR THE FIRST TIME. WE BELIEVE
THERE WILL IN ANY EVENT BE A DELAY WHILE EASTERN NEGOTIATORS
CONSULT WARSAW PACT CAPITALS.

13. WE HAVE DISCUSSED ABOVE POINTS IN GENERAL TERMS WITH UK AND
FRG DELEGATIONS IN VIENNA. UK DELEGATION AGREES. FRG DELEGATION
IS NOT AUTHORIZED AT THIS POINT TO AGREE TO AIR FORCE MANPOWER
BREAKDOWN. FRG DELEGATION IS UNCLEAR AS TO WHETHER NATO BULLETIN
WOULD BE PUBLISHED PRIOR TO OR CONCURRENTLY WITH ADVANCING FRG
PROPOSAL. FRG DELEGATION BELIEVES BONN WOULD BE WILLING TO DROP
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00213 03 OF 03 102130Z POSS DUPE

STEPS DESCRIBED IN PARAS 1 OF FRG PAPER, REFERRING TO TABLING OF
US AND SOVIET DATA AND IN PARA 2A ON PRESENTING SEPARATE FIGURES
FOR FIELD ARMY, SUPPLY FORCES AND TERRITORIAL ARMY AND THIS
CONFORMS WITH POSITION RUTH TOOK IN WASHINGTON. FRG DELEGATION
DOES NOT BELIEVE BONN WOULD AGREE TO CONCEPT IN PARA 6 ABOVE. RESOR

NOTE BY OC/T: NOT PASSED TO SECDEF.

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptoning: Z
Capture Date: 01-Jan-1994 12:00:00 am
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: DATA, DIPLOMATIC DISCUSSIONS, FORCE & TROOP LEVELS, MILITARY PLANS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Sent Date: 10-May-1977 12:00:00 am
Decaption Date: 22 May 2009
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 22 May 2009
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1977MBFRV00213
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Expiration:
Film Number: D770164-1167
Format: TEL
From: MBFR VIENNA
Handling Restrictions:
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1977/newtext/t19770575/aaaacmh.h.tel
Line Count: 339
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Message ID: a1134597-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 7
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: 77 SECTO 4017
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 17-Nov-2004 12:00:00 am
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 2584283
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: FRG PROPOSAL ON DATA ISSUE
TAGS: OVIP, MORG, UK, US, GE, (VANCE, CYRUS R), (GENSCHER, HANS-DIETRICH)
To: SECRETARY LONDON
Type: TE
vdkvgwkey: odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/a1134597-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
22 May 2009
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009